

Dear Ross,

We are writing in response to the NYISO's email to Anbaric dated February 23, 2022, regarding the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment results for Anbaric's Long Island Offshore Wind Export PPTN solicitation response—the Downstate Clean Powerlink. We have identified the root cause of the discrepancy between Anbaric's and the NYISO's "sufficiency" analyses of Anbaric's proposed Downstate Clean Powerlink. This discrepancy is the result of a difference between the SLD for the Dunwoodie substation that Anbaric had prepared and intended to submit as part of its proposal and an early draft SLD for the Dunwoodie substation that Anbaric inadvertently provided to NYISO as part of Anbaric's submitted proposal as a result of a SLD version-control oversight.

Anbaric's analysis of the intended design of the Downstate Clean Powerlink with the intended SLD for the Dunwoodie substation demonstrates that this proposed transmission solution satisfies the NYISO's Public Policy Transmission Need. Moreover, based on the information regarding the various proposed transmission solutions at issue provide to date by NYISO, it appears that the Downstate Clean Powerlink, with the intended SLD for the Dunwoodie substation, can satisfy this PPTN at what could be the lowest cost to New York ratepayers.

The SLD for the Dunwoodie substation that Anbaric had prepared and intended to submit swapped lines W89 and Y51. In the early draft SLD for the Dunwoodie substation that was inadvertently provided to NYISO these lines were not swapped. Other than the difference between these two SLDs for the Dunwoodie substation all other design details regarding the proposed Downstate Clean Powerlink remain the same.

The intended SLD for the Dunwoodie substation (with lines W89 and Y51 swapped) does not lead to an outage of any of the proposed new lines such as Y51 in case of a W89/W90 double circuit contingency. This was confirmed by our original N-1-1 analysis, which was based on the intended functionality for the Dunwoodie substation in case of this contingency. Our analysis did not show any violations resulting from any of the contingencies related to these lines.

The differences between the intended SLD and the inadvertently provided early draft SLD for the Dunwoodie substation are immaterial in the sense that there are no differences in the switchgear layout, bill of materials, required CAPEX, or construction schedule regarding the Dunwoodie substation or any other aspect of the overall proposed Downstate Clean Powerlink (other than the aforementioned swapping of lines W89 and Y51 at the Dunwoodie substation).

However, the difference between the intended SLD and the inadvertently provided early draft SLD for the Dunwoodie substation led to a difference in the formulation of contingency definitions related to the Dunwoodie substation used in the TARA analysis performed by Anbaric and the contingency definition relied on by NYISO in its analysis, and thus to the observed discrepancy between the Anbaric and NYISO analyses.

To ensure you have the correct information to review our intended design for the Downstate Clean Powerlink (with the intended SLD for the Dunwoodie substation), we have attached the intended SLD, and done so for the 5 documents in which the Dunwoodie SLD appears in our submission package. These documents are in NYISO's Box Folder subfolder "NYISO LI PPTN Solicitation Documents - 2022-03-07"

- Attachment A – Project Analysis Report
- Attachment C – Data Submission for Public Policy Transmission Projects
- Attachment C1C – Proposed Simplified One Line Diagram
- Attachment C1D – Proposed Detailed One Line Diagram
- Attachment C8 – Planning Study Results

We apologize sincerely for the inconvenience caused by providing the NYISO with a SLD for the Dunwoodie substation that does not correspond with our intended design of the Downstate Clean Powerlink. Thank you for your understanding, and we look forward to answering any clarification questions you may have.

Thank you,
Janice Fuller

